

REMARKS

This Amendment, submitted in response to the Office Action dated April 23, 2007, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-26 are all the claims pending in the application.

As a preliminary matter, Applicant thanks the Examiner for discussing the application with the Applicant's undersigned representative on May 24, 2007. After discussing the application with the Examiner, the Examiner indicated that he will give the Applicant's arguments further consideration upon receipt of the response. Therefore, Applicant submits the following.

I. Rejection of claims 1-6, 8, 10-14, 16-17 and 19-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6, 8, 10-14, 16-17 and 19-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Davies et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0002034).

Claim 1 recites:

"A wireless communication device capable of a **connectionless oriented broadcast** comprising:
a transceiver for transmitting and receiving data to and from an external device;
a synchronization information generator which generates synchronization information;
a broadcast data packet generator which generates a broadcast data packet containing broadcast information; and
a controller for broadcasting the synchronization information through the transceiver and synchronizing to the external device, and then controlling to transmit the broadcast data packet to the external device through the transceiver **without a request for a connection setup.**"

As discussed on, for example, page 2, para. 4 of the Applicant's specification, Bluetooth specification 1.2. requires a connection setup prior to the data transaction. The connection setup

includes an inquiry, inquiry scan, page, and page scan which results in wasted resources and the inefficient allocation of broadcast messages. Therefore, as discussed on, for example, page 15, para. 55 of the Applicant's specification, an exemplary embodiment of the present invention provides for the broadcast of data without requiring a connection setup procedure such as an inquiry, inquiry scan, page and page scan.

The Examiner asserts that Davies teaches the elements of claim 1. However, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Davies requires a connection in order to broadcast data. As discussed on page 3, para. 38, a 'pull' mode allows a user to set up a connection with a server 56. Further, as discussed in Davies page 4, paras. 43-44, a portable device is required to join, as a slave, a piconet administered by a beacon, as a piconet master. An inquiry allows a would-be slave to find a base station and issue a request to join the piconet. Davies indicates that the Bluetooth inquiry procedure has been proposed specifically to solve the problem of bringing together master and slave therefore, Davies proposes to piggy-back a broadcast channel on the inquiry messages issued by the master. Therefore, Davies discloses that an inquiry message issued by the base station has an extra field appended to them capable of carrying a user-defined payload which is used to carry broadcast information. See page 4, para. 50.

Further, as discussed in para. 9 of Davies "In one arrangement, the additional data field may carry at least 64 bits of data. As will be described in greater detail hereinafter with respect to embodiments of the invention, this can improve the inquiry performance of a Bluetooth system, shortening the time to establish a connection for data exchange."

Therefore, Davies discloses the addition of an extra field to an inquiry message sent by a master and is not directed to connectionless broadcast as disclosed in the applicant's invention as

claimed. Moreover, and contrary to the exemplary embodiment of the present invention, Davies requires an inquiry (connection setup) in order to broadcast data.

Since claim 1 is directed to connectionless oriented broadcast, which is not disclosed in Davies, claim 1 and its dependent claims should be deemed allowable. To the extent claims 9 and 17 recite similar subject matter, claims 9 and 17 and their dependent claims should be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 25

Claim 25 recites “wherein the broadcast data packet is transmitted to the external device through the transceiver without an inquiry and paging procedure to join a piconet.”

Page 4, para. 50 of Davies discloses “the applicants propose that the inquiry messages issued by the base station have an extra field appended to them, capable of carrying a user-defined payload (CA DATA). In the CA scenario, this payload is used to carry broadcast information, or keys, to CA terminals during the inquiry procedure.”

Therefore, Davies teaches the use of an inquiry procedure to join a piconet which is contrary to the recitations of claim 25. Consequently, claim 25 should be deemed allowable.

II. Rejection of claims 7 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 7 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0002034) in view of Rankin (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0081972). Claims 7 and 15 should be deemed allowable by virtue of their dependency to claims 1 and 9 for at least the reasons set forth above. Moreover, Rankin does not cure the deficiencies of Davies.

III. Rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0002034) in view of Bluetooth Specification Version 1.0B. Claim 18

should be deemed allowable by virtue of its dependency to claim 17 for at least the reasons set forth above. Moreover, Bluetooth 1.0B does not cure the deficiencies of Davies.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER


Ruthleen E. Uy
Registration No. 51,361

Date: June 25, 2007